

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 17, 2008 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-41 are currently pending. Claims 1-41 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §101

Claims 41 stands rejected under 35 USC §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In this paper, independent claim 41 has been amended to recite “A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions” which Applicants respectfully submit falls into the defined statutory classes set forth under 35 USC §101. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be removed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-14, 16, 19-23, 25 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs et al., EP Patent EP 0917355 (“Szucs”) in view of Eyer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,401,242 (“Eyer”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent claim 1 includes the claimed feature of “splitting the at least one service information table into sub-tables, wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream.” The Office Action on Page 3 states that Szucs does not disclose this claimed feature. However, the Office Action submits that Eyer discloses at Column 6, lines 1-12 that “that the satellite receiver receives all the global and local program information and filters out the channels maps data from local and global program information (Office Action, Page 3).

In particular, the cited portion of Eyer states:

The satellite MUX, modulator and encoder 100 also receives all or, typically, a portion of the global programming services themselves (e.g., digital audio and video) as well as channel map data for both the global and local programming services, and other configuration data, discussed in greater detail in connection with FIG. 2. The channel map data correlates the programming services with channel assignments (e.g., channel numbers and frequencies) at a decoder. The channel map data may also be used by an IRD to filter out IPG data which is not used by the IRD. Separate channel maps can be provided for the global and regional programming services.

(Eyer; Column 6, lines 1-12).

Applicants respectfully submit that Eyer does not disclose “splitting the at least one service information table into sub-tables, wherein each sub-table identifies a certain transport stream.” (Emphasis Added). The cited portion of Eyer merely discusses channel map data which correlates programming services with channel assignments at a decoder. The cited portions of Eyer do not disclose, teach, or suggest splitting service information into sub-tables. Therefore, for at least this reason independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-24 which ultimately depend from independent claim 1 are allowable for at least the same reason.

Independent claims 25 and 27 are allowable for at least similar reasons discussed above regarding independent claim 1. Independent claim 25 includes the claimed feature of “wherein the service information is adapted to be split into sub-tables. Similarly, independent claim 27 includes the claimed feature of “splitting the service information table into sub-tables.” These features are not disclosed in Szucs or Eyer. Therefore, for at least this reason Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 25 and 27 are allowable over the combination of Szucs and Eyer.

Moreover, independent claim 1 is allowable for at least an additional reason. Independent claim 1 includes the claimed feature of “establishing a mother table configured to maintain a sub-table of the certain transport stream and sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream.” The Office Action states that this claimed feature may be found in Eyer at Column 6, lines 19-22. Applicants respectfully disagree as the cited portion of Eyer merely states:

A combined signal containing the IPG data, global programming services, and channel map data is provided to a transmitter 110 for communication via satellite to a receiver 120. The received signal is then provided to an IRD 130.

(Eyer; Column 6, lines 19-22).

Applicants respectfully submit that the combined signal containing IPG data discussed in Eyer does not teach the claimed features of “establishing a mother table configured to maintain a sub-table of the certain transport stream and sub-tables of adjacent transport streams of the certain transport stream.” (Emphasis Added). Therefore, for at least this additional reason independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited combination of Szucs and Eyer.

Dependent claims 2-24 which ultimately depend from independent claim 1 are allowable for at least the same reason.

Independent claims 28 and 29 are allowable for at least similar reasons discussed above regarding independent claim 1. Both independent claims 28 and 29 include the claimed feature of “means for discovering a mother table from the broadcast transmission, the mother table announcing a set of sub-tables each sub-table indentifying a local transport stream.” These features are not disclosed in Szucs or Eyer. Therefore, for at least this reasons Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 28 and 29 are allowable over the combination of Szucs and Eyer. Dependent claims 30-32 which ultimately depend from independent claim 29 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 29.

Claims 15, 17, 18, 26, 31-36 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs in view of Eyer as applied to claims 1-14 , and further in view of Jensen et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,671,219 (“Jensen”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Independent claims 26, 33, and 40 each include the claimed feature of “splitting the service information table into sub-tables.” The Office Action repeats on pages 14, 16, and 19 that Szucs does not disclose this claimed feature. However, the Office Action submits that Eyer discloses at Column 6, lines 1-12 “that the satellite receiver receives all the global and local program information and filters out the channels maps data from local and global program information (Office Action, Pages 14, 16, and 19). Applicants respectfully submit that Eyer does not disclose “splitting the at least one service information table into sub-tables.” (Emphasis Added). The cited portion of Eyer merely discusses channel map data which correlated programming services with channel assignments at a decoder. Therefore, for at least this reason independent claims 26, 33, and 40 are in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 34-39 which ultimately depend from independent claim 33 are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 33. Moreover, applicants respectfully submit that the combined signal containing IPG data discussed in Eyer does not teach the claimed features of “establishing a mother table configured to identify the transport stream of the conincident headend and transport streams of adjacent headends to the conincident headend.” (Emphasis

Added). Therefore, for at least this additional reason independent claims 33, 40 are allowable over the cited combination of Szucs and Eyer.

Dependent claims 15 and 17-18 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1 from which they ultimately depend.

Claims 24, 37 and 41 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Szucs in view of Eyer as applied to claims 1-14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,965,770 ("Walsh"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Dependent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1 from which it ultimately depends.

Dependent claim 37 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 33 from which it ultimately depends.

Independent claim 41 has been amended by this response to overcome the 35 USC §101 rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 41 is allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 discussed above.

Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and a finding of their allowability. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Please feel free to contact the undersigned should any questions arise with respect to this case that may be addressed by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 17, 2008

By: /William J. Allen/_____
William J. Allen
Registration No. 51,393
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 South Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Fax: 312-463-5001